



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,549	02/08/2002	Joseph J. Pantuso	NAI1P094/02.013.01	9867

28875 7590 05/10/2004

SILICON VALLEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
P.O. BOX 721120  
SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER
----------

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/071,549

Applicant(s)

PANTUSO ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☒ The drawing correction filed on 30 April 2004 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
GILBERTO BARRON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner has withdrawn objection to fig. 2, 4, 5 and 6 due to correction by Applicant. Applicant's arguments that Maloney and Dev are not combinable are not persuasive since both De and Maloney deal with network environment that consists of nodes or devices that can be connected as WAN (see abstract of Maloney and fig. 7a of Dev); and where management of a network does involve security such as firewall, encryption, passwords, access and security analysis to ensure the integrity of the network and therefore combinable. As per Applicant's suggestion that the prior art of record singly or in combination fails to disclose "trace is shown to involve a plurality of displayed network segments shown to be spanning different cities of different countries displayed on the world map", Examiner refers Applicant to col. 12, lines 12-15 of Maloney for displaying the traffic events utilizing the firewall and tracing at least one of the traffic events utilizing the firewall where one of the tracing events may be normal or up normal usage patterns and displaying a map with an illustration of the trace thereon utilizing the firewall (see col. 11, lines 39-67 and col. 12, lines 1-2 where after the analysis of an event map of the trace is displayed).

Dev et al (5, 261,044 A) display a network world map of network events and different views within the map (see col. 13, lines 12-29 where multiple views of network is displayed including a map of the world that is called highest level view). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Dev et al multiple view such as world map view in Maloney's information security analysis and monitoring network system in order to have a broad and narrow LAN/WAN monitoring in either a passive and/or active mode with respect to network events within a world map or region or a location within the network that is being monitored..